

The Smithfield Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Members present were Mr. Bill Davidson, Vice Chair; Mr. Michael Swecker, Ms. Julia Hillegass, Mr. Larry Odom, Mr. Randy Pack, and Mr. Charles Bryan. Member Ms. Virginia Smith was absent. Staff members present were Mr. William G. Saunders, IV, Planner/GIS Coordinator and Mr. William Riddick, Town Attorney. There were three (3) citizens present.

Vice Chair Davidson - I would like to call the meeting of April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013 of the Smithfield Planning Commission meeting to order. If you would all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

*Everyone present stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.*

Vice Chair Davidson – For those of you that would like to remain standing, Mr. Odom will offer a word of prayer.

Mr. Odom – Lord, we thank you for this opportunity to meet as a group. We pray the decisions that we make this evening are based on wisdom and guidance that you give us in our daily lives. We pray that these decisions would also benefit the citizens of our community. Through your son our Lord Jesus Christ we ask this prayer. Amen.

Vice Chair Davidson – Thank you, Mr. Odom. Next we have the Director of Planning, Engineering & Public Works Activity Report.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Mr. Hopkins is out sick tonight. The Smithfield Foods Test Kitchen is 98% complete. The True Value project is 98% complete. All of the other commercial projects that we have had underway thus far have been completed.

Vice Chair Davidson – Next is Upcoming Meetings and Activities. On April 16<sup>th</sup> Board of Zoning Appeals meeting has been cancelled. The Board of Historic & Architectural Review will meet on April 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. The Town Council Committee meetings will be April 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> at 4:00 p.m. The Town Council meeting will be May 7<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. The Planning Commission will meet on May 14<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. Next we have Public Comments. Anyone is invited to speak on any matter except what is a scheduled public hearing. Do we have anyone signed up? Next is Planning Commission Comments. Are there any comments? We will move to the ECO Design Review – 1617

South Church Street – Gary & Gayle Terwilliger, applicants. Could we have a staff report please?

Planner/GIS Coordinator – Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. and Mrs. Terwilliger want to renovate the old Daily Press building at the corner of Smithfield Boulevard and South Church Street. The elevations that you have are a wonderful improvement on what has been there for so long. They are taking the old mansard roof off. They are adding cornice work at the top. They are putting new brick veneer on the entire building. It is going to be a wonderful addition to that corner. I will highlight a couple of notes that are listed on the staff report. On the South Church Street end of the building it shows three windows in the rendering but there will only be two windows. I assume they will be evenly spaced similar to the way the three are but that was inaccurate in the rendering. Also, the lamp posts that are shown on either side of the front door on the South Church Street side those are just something that the artist put on there but will not actually be going in. The actual location of the lamp posts will be the same as it is now. Those are shown on the site plan sheet that you have. There is also another illustration in your packet that shows the type of lamp. They propose to put a more colonial type lamp in place of the contemporary 60's era style that is there now. It will be another nice addition. Another note is the sign proposal. There is some question about whether the sign proposal is going to require modification or not to work on that site. It is going to have to be relocated to be at least ten feet from the right-of-way line. The rendering that you have may or may not reflect the final outcome on the sign. I am sure that the applicant is going to tell us more on that than what we are shown in our packet. If you see the location of the existing sign on the site plan that location cannot go forward as the location of the sign. That location will have to be modified and probably moved back approximately six feet from where it is shown on the site plan which may require modification of the sign itself to make that happen. This may be something that we need more information on either tonight from the applicant or at a future meeting or something that could be worked out administratively later.

Vice Chair Davidson – Thank you, Mr. Saunders. Would the applicants like to speak on this matter? Please come to the podium and give your name and address for the record.

Mr. Gary Terwilliger – My name is Gary Terwilliger. I live at 10 Oak Alley in Smithfield. My wife Gayle is also here. We have some completed architectural drawings that we just got back a couple of days ago. I do have an aerial photograph of the site that I would like to submit to you for the sign location. I will hand those out. I would like to acknowledge publicly Mr. Ron Pack helped us design the building. Mr. Pack put a lot to time and effort into it.

Mr. Swecker – Approximately how many parking spaces do you anticipate?

Mr. Terwilliger – The use is going to be as a dental office.

Dr. Gayle Terwilliger - I live at 10 Oak Alley in Smithfield. My anticipation is that there would be no more than twelve to fifteen people there at a time. I did have a sketch of the parking places from the real estate people. I counted them then but I did not include that in this. There is parking on both sides of the building. I believe we would be putting lines in as part of what we do.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – Because they intended to use the parking spaces, parking lot, travel ways, and curb and gutter in the same manner that it is developed currently they were not required to submit a site plan. At our pre-application meeting we determined that based on the use they would have sufficient parking for a medical office of that size already there. They will have enough parking even though I cannot quote you the number right now.

Mr. Bryan – Are you resurfacing the parking area?

Mr. Terwilliger – We are probably going to seal it and fix the cracks for now. We do not have immediate funds for resurfacing.

Mr. Bryan – I was looking at the rendering that was presented the ramp to the entrance is white in color that is not the way it is currently.

Mr. Terwilliger – It is asphalt.

Mr. Bryan – Is it white?

Mr. Terwilliger – No sir. It is asphalt. The rendering given to us is inaccurate.

Dr. Gayle Terwilliger – The ramp that you are describing was the artist's concept. What we plan to do is the same sort of thing you have in town where the sidewalk slopes to the curbside. It is just more attractive and I think safer.

Mr. Terwilliger – The Google Earth map that you have in front of you we are trying to show the line of site coming out of Smithfield Boulevard onto South Church Street. We initially talked about was moving the sign back three feet. After looking at it some more we realized that we needed to go back ten feet from the property line. We would move the westerly direction on the side that is closer to the road and probably back about six feet so that we get away from the ten foot. The sign has been there for twenty some years before VDOT widened the road. If we get ten feet away from the property line it would also leave us with two ten foot traffic ways probably with a couple of feet to spare. We may have to go a foot or so onto the curb and gutter on the inboard side of the property there. It will depend on what kind of sign base that we put up. If we shrink the size to the masonry base then we might not have to do that. There has been a lot of concern about the sign and the line of sight. I drew a line from the stop line on Smithfield Boulevard straight over. The white rectangular piece is the sign which is currently eight feet long. The line should probably go at the bottom a little bit which would increase the sight line. It comes up to, conservatively, four hundred and fifty feet with the cars coming southbound. The site is almost past the Terminix building. If you count the number of seconds by the time cars is available by sight it is six or maybe eight seconds going from the stop line at the intersection. The stop line is really back about ten feet because of the pedestrian crosswalk.

Planner/GIS Coordinator - It is acknowledged that the stop line is further back than it would be if there was not a pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Terwilliger - Everyone rolls up to the pedestrian walkway at the intersection which is where you have to pull up to in order to see. If you were to look from a practical sense by moving up from the pedestrian walkway then your line of sight could be six hundred feet. It is a long way.

Vice Chair Davidson – Are you talking about moving the sign back into this driveway?

Mr. Terwilliger – Perhaps maybe only up to a foot. It is eight feet long right now. We will probably make it six feet long. We may have to move it a foot into the driveway.

Mr. Pack – You will be inside of the ten foot buffer that is required by the ordinance.

Dr. Gayle Terwilliger – Yes. It was Mr. Wayne Griffin's suggestion the other day that we do that.

Vice Chair Davidson – It looks to me like from the end of that brick base to your curb it is only about a foot.

Mr. Terwilliger – Yes sir.

Vice Chair Davidson – So you are saying that you would move it back to that curb and then another foot or so into the driveway.

Mr. Terwilliger – Yes sir. It would probably be two feet. I think the base is eight feet long now. We can make that four feet and shorten that up some.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – So you are proposing to make the base the same width as the sign? Looking at your rendering it shows the base about a brick length on either side of the six foot sign. So you are proposing now that the brick width would come off and the base would be six feet which is the same as the sign above it.

Mr. Gary Terwilliger – I am not sure. I do know that we want to move the base ten feet off of the property line and contingent upon the travel area that it may be up to a foot.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – I do not want to split hairs on the location necessarily tonight. What you are really before the Planning Commission for is more for the design review rather than the location. The location relates to the ordinance. There is not really flexibility in this application for the location approval. If you are going to modify the base then that reflects on the architectural review tonight. That is why I was trying to find out if the base was going to be changed from your rendering because that does bear on what the Planning Commission needs to vote on tonight which is how the sign is going to look.

Mr. Terwilliger – It will be a brick base with an appropriate style. I am not sure what we are going to do up top yet. I did not realize this until the other day, when I talked to Mr. Pack, that we can go thirty two square feet.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – Yes thirty two square feet.

Mr. Terwilliger – We can make it a little taller or something. I know we can get the base within ten feet away from the property line. We will still have twenty feet for the thoroughfare.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – I think if you can get it ten feet off of the road then you are not going to have sight distance issue. You could go taller if you needed to once you are ten feet away in that location. That is the best that the Town Engineer and I can tell. What really bears tonight is how this is going to end up looking to the Planning Commission when you make these modifications.

Vice Chair Davidson – I would like to say that what you are going to do to that building is great. That place has been an eyesore for a long time. I am not sure that we can address the sign issue until we have more information. I do not want to hold you up for another month. Would you be amiable to having us discuss approval of the design review on the building itself and then have the sign issue taken up with staff to see if we can come to a better agreement? I do not know where we are as far as code. I know what the code is. I do not know what we can vote on and what we cannot vote on with this rendering. It is not an architectural rendering. This is not really an architectural review tonight anyway.

Town Attorney – Well, actually it is. That is exactly what it is. You are supposed to review this as the rendering to see if that passes muster based on your guidelines. If you think you do not have enough information on the sign then you can take action on the rendering and defer the sign until a later date when he comes back with a better design.

Vice Chair Davidson – That is kind of what I was trying to say but not as eloquently as you.

Town Attorney – This is what you are voting on today. Is the architectural proposal consistent with your guidelines? If it does, then you should take action on that. If it does not, then you need to tell him why it does not.

Mr. Pack – I met with the Terwilligers on the site yesterday and expressed very similar opinions as we are talking about tonight. Personally, I have no problem with the building. He knows that he has to be within the ten feet. We cannot even make that decision if we wanted to. Mr. Terwilliger is looking for tonight is basically approval of the building and the location of the sign. After discussing with him that we really do not have any jurisdiction over where the sign goes. What may suit us best tonight is to approve

the building as designed and have them work with staff to keep the sign within the ten feet that meets our sign regulations. I believe that can be handled administratively.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – If the Planning Commission does not take action on the sign and the building is approved separately then the Town Manager could approve the design of the sign administratively. They can bring it back as a separate application to the Planning Commission if they would prefer that over the Town Manager approval.

Town Attorney – I do not think you have to do a separate application. I think you can just table consideration of the plan design for the sign then they can move on. If it happens in less than thirty days I would be really shocked. They have lots of time to come up with a really good plan of what they want to do with their sign. Then they can bring it back to any of the next several Planning Commission meetings that we are going to have.

Mr. Terwilliger – Can staff or the Planning Commission approve the location where we want to put it with the masonry base then we can go back and get some kind of rendering to bring back to you. I have been told by staff that you did not want a sign on the building.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – That is not true at all.

Mr. Terwilliger – We kind of get to the point where we are either ten foot.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – Just to set the record straight, the reason that the monument base is there now is because staff said just to take the box off to solve the site distance issue. We thought that maybe it could be modified for the next owner. It was because staff wanted to try and make it work for the next owner that it is there today. If we can make that work for you there then great but If not if you go on the other side of your entrance you can do anything that you want over there. If you want to keep it where it is then it will have to meet the finite choices there to make it work.

Town Attorney – I think that the ordinance would permit you to have a sign on your building. You can have both. You do not just have to have one or the other.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – They can have an attached and detached. They can have both.

Town Attorney – You could have this by the road and then have a tasteful sign of your choice on your building too.

Mr. Swecker – My concern is the traffic coming in from Smithfield Boulevard onto South Church Street. The people down there have complained about how long it takes them to enter on Church Street and now we are going to have additional traffic coming.

Town Attorney – It is an existing building. You do not really have any jurisdiction over that. They are not changing anything. They are buying an existing structure. They are not modifying the traffic footprint or the building footprint. They are not doing anything so that is not for consideration by the Planning Commission. If they were scraping it clean and starting over then you can say whether you like it or not. In this instance it is an existing structure. It has been there for many years. For lack of a better term it is grandfathered.

Mr. Swecker – I agree. You are right.

Planner/GIS Coordinator – It is zoned commercial.

Ms. Hillegass – Mr. Chairman, I think this is a great improvement to this site. The building is going to look so much better. You all are going to do a fabulous job, I am sure. I move that we approve the design of the building tonight and let them work on the sign issues with the staff.

Mr. Odom – Second.

Vice Chair Davidson – A motion has been made and properly seconded that we approve the building and work out the sign issue with staff. All in favor signify by saying aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Mr. Bryan voted aye, Vice Chair Davidson voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Mr. Odom voted aye, Mr. Pack voted aye and Mr. Swecker voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Vice Chair Davidson – I think this is going to be a great improvement. It has been an eyesore for a long time.

Dr. Gayle Terwilliger – It is not going to be a lot of traffic. It is not going to be dangerous amounts of increased traffic there.

Mr. Swecker – I was just remembering people in the past. It was just a comment not a complaint or anything like that.

Town Attorney – They have been trying to see if the intersection meets the warrant that VDOT requires for a stoplight but it does not. We have talked about a traffic light there but it does not meet the standards.

Mr. Odom – Dr. Terwilliger, do you have an anticipated date of completion?

Dr. Gayle Terwilliger – I really do not. I do not know how long it will take to go through the county.

Vice Chair Davidson – Next is the Approval of the March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Meeting Minutes.

Town Attorney – Mr. Chairman, I recommend that they be approved as presented.

Ms. Hillegass – I make a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Mr. Swecker – Second.

Vice Chair Davidson – A motion has been made and properly seconded. All in favor signify by saying aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Mr. Bryan voted aye, Vice Chair Davidson voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Mr. Odom voted aye, Mr. Pack voted aye and Mr. Swecker voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Vice Chair Davidson – Is there any further business tonight? The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.



Mr. Bill Davidson  
Vice Chair



Mr. William G. Saunders IV  
Planner/GIS Coordinator